REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the above-identified Office Action claims 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 101 as well as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claims 13-15 by cancelling Claim 13 and amending Claim 14 so that it now recites a method for the recited step of placing the compound of Claim 1 into a pharmaceutical composition in a unit dosage form. As such, rejections under 35 U.S.C. section 101 and section 112 are deemed to be obviated.

Claim 16 has been rejected because of lack of enablement. Applicant has amended Claim 16 so that it is now directed solely to the method of treatment of disorders and, as such, is considered enabled.

Claims 1 and 12 have been rejected as unpatentable over Jensen et al. and Lohse et al. The Examiner has stated that the difference between claims 1 and 12 and the prior art compounds is that the instant claim replaces one hydrogen of the prior art compound with a methyl. As the Examiner states, the presumption is that homologues are expected to be prepared by the same method and to have generally the same properties may be rebuttable by the showing of unexpected effects. Applicant notes that the Jensen et al. reference relates to the effect on basicity of substituent positioning and does not disclose any pharmaceutical activity of its compounds. Thus, the fact that Applicant has found pharmaceutical activity in its claimed compounds is an unexpected effect over the disclosure of Jensen et al. and, thus, should be patentable thereover. The Lohse et al. reference relates to the inhibition of glycoside processing enzymes in his compounds. The activity in glycosidase inhibition as shown in the Lohse reference is not related to activity in diseases caused by malfunction of the muscarinic or acetocholene systems as in the subject application. Lohse et al. only refers to utility in diabetes and influenza, rather than the cognitive conditions specified in the subject invention. Thus Lohse et al. is not directly related to any of the indications specified in

the subject application. In addition, the structurally closest compounds in Lohse et al. (compounds 14-16, Table 1, page 662) are described as being ineffective in inhibiting the glycoside-processing enzymes (page 662, right hand column, first sentence of penultimate paragraph). As a result, Lohse et al. teaches away from the compounds of the subject invention as being effective for the treatment of disorders caused by the malfunction of the acetylcholine or muscarinic systems.

As set forth in the subject application, Example 1 of the present application surprisingly shows that a compound in which R_7 = methyl acts as a partial M_1 agonist. This is not something that can be predicted and, thus, shows non-obviousness in the subject compounds, as recited in the claims.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

No further fee or petition is believed to be necessary. However, should any further fee be needed, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0920, and deem this paper to be the required petition.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he/she is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9 March 2009

Daniel M. Gurfinkel
Reg. No. 34,177
Husch Blackwell Sanders Welsh & Katz
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1511
Fax: (312) 655-1501